

## REFERENCES

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2011. Diabetes Data & Trends. Available: <http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/DDTSTRS/default.aspx> [accessed 12 December 2011].
- Eyre H, Kahn R, Robertson RM. 2004. Preventing cancer, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes: a common agenda for the American Cancer Society, the American Diabetes Association, and the American Heart Association. *CA Cancer J Clin* 54(4):190–207.
- Janesick A, Blumberg B. 2011. Minireview: PPAR $\gamma$  as the target of obesogens. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol* 127(1–2):4–8.
- Kim J, Peterson KE, Scanlon KS, Fitzmaurice GM, Must A, Oken E, et al. 2006. Trends in overweight from 1980 through 2001 among preschool-aged children enrolled in a health maintenance organization. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 14(7):1107–1112.
- Nadal A, Alonso-Magdalena P, Soriano S, Quesada I, Ropero AB. 2009. The pancreatic  $\beta$ -cell as a target of estrogens and xenoestrogens: Implications for blood glucose homeostasis and diabetes. *Mol Cell Endocrinol* 304(1–2):63–68.
- NIH Obesity Research Task Force. 2011. Strategic Plan for NIH Obesity Research. NIH publication no. 11-5493. Available: <http://www.obesityresearch.nih.gov/about/strategic-plan.aspx> [accessed 12 December 2011].
- Ogden C, Carroll M. 2010. Prevalence of Obesity among Children and Adolescents: United States, Trends 1963–1965 through 2007–2008. Available: [http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hestat/obesity\\_child\\_07\\_08/obesity\\_child\\_07\\_08.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hestat/obesity_child_07_08/obesity_child_07_08.htm) [accessed 12 December 2011].
- Thayer KA, Heindel JJ, Bucher JR, Gallo MA. 2012. Role of environmental chemicals in diabetes and obesity: a National Toxicology Program workshop review. *Environ Health Perspect* 120:779–789.
- White House Task Force on Childhood Obesity. 2010. Solving the Problem of Childhood Obesity Within a Generation: White House Task Force on Childhood Obesity Report to the President. Available: [http://www.letsmove.gov/sites/letsmove.gov/files/TaskForce\\_on\\_Childhood\\_Obesity\\_May2010\\_FullReport.pdf](http://www.letsmove.gov/sites/letsmove.gov/files/TaskForce_on_Childhood_Obesity_May2010_FullReport.pdf) [accessed 12 December 2011].
- World Health Organization. 2011. Diabetes Programme: Facts and Figures about Diabetes. Available: <http://www.who.int/diabetes/facts/en/> [accessed 12 December 2011].

## Methylmercury Effects and Exposures: Who Is at Risk?

doi:10.1289/ehp.1205357

Two articles in this issue of *EHP* represent recent syntheses of research on the effects of mercury exposure from fish consumption: Karagas et al. (2012) reviewed the emerging research on health effects of low-level exposures to methylmercury (MeHg), and Oken et al. (2012) summarized the complexities of providing clear and uniform fish consumption advice to reduce MeHg exposure while balancing nutrient intake, ecologic concerns, and economic issues. These two papers emerged from workshops convened in September 2010 and July 2011 by the Coastal Marine Mercury Ecosystem Research Collaborative (C-MERC) and sponsored by the Dartmouth Superfund Research Program and its partners. C-MERC brought together a group of 50 scientists and stakeholders to work jointly to gather and analyze existing data and to publish synthesis papers on the fate of mercury from its environmental sources to seafood consumers—issues of critical importance for informing public policy.

Mercury, particularly its organic form (MeHg), is a global contaminant and toxicant of major concern for humans and wildlife (Driscoll et al. 2007; Fitzgerald et al. 2007; Grandjean et al. 2005; Mahaffey et al. 2009). Mercury is third (after arsenic and lead) on the 2011 Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) priority list of 275 hazardous substances (ATSDR 2011), which includes substances that present the most significant potential threats to human health in the United States. MeHg has long been known as a potent neurotoxicant, particularly due to incidents of acute and high-level exposures (e.g., Minimata, Japan; Iraq), but neurological effects have been documented in island populations that consume large quantities of marine mammals or seafood (Axelrad et al. 2007; Cohen et al. 2005; Rice 2004). Moreover, recent epidemiologic studies have revealed evidence of a range of health effects in adults and children at MeHg exposure levels lower than previously observed (Lynch et al. 2010; Mergler et al. 2007; Oken et al. 2008). In this issue of *EHP*, Karagas et al. (2012) provide a comprehensive review of the current scientific evidence for effects of low-level exposures to MeHg on birth outcomes, neurocognitive outcomes, the cardiovascular system, and immune function. The authors recommend that future studies investigate sex-specific effects and genetic susceptibility, and that they include more precise exposure indicators, outcome measures



Celia Chen

with mechanistic bases, and consideration of nonlinear dose–response relationships. Their review helps to set the stage for future research on the human effects of low-level MeHg exposure.

Fish are the most important agents of MeHg exposure for humans, and consumption of contaminated fish is a serious public health concern (Mahaffey et al. 2009; Oken et al. 2005; Sunderland 2007). Currently, all 50 U.S. states have fish advisories for inland and coastal waters, and states on the Atlantic coast, as well as Alaska and Hawaii, have statewide coastal advisories [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 2010]. Consumption of marine fish and shellfish is the primary means of human exposure to MeHg; approximately 92% of the global fish and shellfish harvest for human consumption is marine [United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Bank, and World Resources Institute 2003], with the majority coming from coastal fisheries (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations 2010). Most people trying to reduce MeHg exposure risk do so through their choices in buying and eating seafood. Oken et al. (2012) discuss the wide range of trade-offs facing fish consumers and the difficulties in evaluating current fish consumption advice. Consumers need to consider not only the contaminant concentrations in fish but also their nutritional value, the sustainability of the fishery, and the cost of different fish choices. Moreover, there is little guidance for specific subpopulations with different exposure risks due to factors such as age or baseline intake of fish. The authors recommend that fish consumption advice address these multiple perspectives and provide a clear and simple message. Ultimately, fish consumption advice should protect public health on a global scale and promote sustainability of the world's fisheries as a critical source of human nutrition.

Currently, important national and international policy decisions are being made concerning the environmental impacts of mercury. The widespread threat to human health posed by MeHg has prompted the United States to pass a mercury rule for controlling atmospheric emissions (U.S. EPA 2011) and the UNEP to forge a broad consensus

among 140 participating countries to control mercury contamination through a global, legally binding mercury agreement (UNEP 2009). Moreover, U.S. Senate and House bills have been introduced in order to establish a national mercury monitoring network to track long-term trends in mercury levels in the atmosphere and in terrestrial, freshwater, and coastal ecosystems (Comprehensive National Mercury Monitoring Act 2011a, 2011b). To provide a synthesis of current marine mercury science to inform policy making, C-MERC stakeholders identified the major environmental and health policy questions associated with MeHg, and C-MERC scientists reviewed and summarized the current scientific knowledge available for addressing those questions. In addition to the two articles in this issue of *EHP*, additional papers will be published in an upcoming special issue of *Environmental Research* on the fate of MeHg in estuaries, coastal oceans, and the open ocean. The goal of all of these reports is to provide scientists and policy makers with an understanding of the links between environmental processes that affect MeHg levels in aquatic ecosystems and human MeHg exposure and health risks. These links are critical to predicting how local and global changes in environmental mercury levels will ultimately influence MeHg contamination of seafood and the resulting human exposure risk.

*The author declares she has no actual or potential competing financial interests.*

**Celia Chen**

Department of Biological Sciences  
Dartmouth College  
Hanover, New Hampshire  
E-mail: [celia.chen@dartmouth.edu](mailto:celia.chen@dartmouth.edu)

*Celia Chen is an aquatic ecologist whose research over the last 17 years has focused on the fate and effects of metal contaminants in aquatic food webs both in freshwater and estuarine ecosystems. She studies metal bioaccumulation in the laboratory using freshwater and estuarine crustaceans and fish, and she also investigates metal bioaccumulation and trophic transfer in field studies in lakes and estuaries in the northeast United States. She is a project leader and research translation core leader in the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences-funded Dartmouth Superfund Research Program (grant P42 ES007373), which sponsored C-MERC.*

## REFERENCES

- ATSDR (Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry). 2011. Detailed Data Table for the 2011 Priority list of Hazardous Substances that Will Be the Subject of Toxicological Profiles. Available: [http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/SPL/resources/ATSDR\\_2011\\_SPL\\_Detailed\\_Data\\_Table.pdf](http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/SPL/resources/ATSDR_2011_SPL_Detailed_Data_Table.pdf) [accessed 2 May 2012].
- Axelrad DA, Bellinger DC, Ryan LM, Woodruff TJ. 2007. Dose-response relationship of prenatal mercury exposure and IQ: an integrative analysis of epidemiologic data. *Environ Health Perspect* 115:609–615.
- Chen CY, Serrell N, Evers DC, Fleishman BJ, Lambert KF, Weiss J, et al. 2008. Meeting report: methylmercury in marine ecosystems—from sources to seafood consumers. *Environ Health Perspect* 116:1706–1712.
- Cohen JT, Bellinger DC, Shaywitz BA. 2005. A quantitative analysis of prenatal methylmercury exposure and cognitive development. *Am J Prev Med* 29(4):353–365.
- Comprehensive National Mercury Monitoring Act. 2011a. H.R. 3391, 112th Congress, 1st Session. Available: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-112hr3391ih/html/BILLS-112hr3391ih.htm> [accessed 9 May 2012].
- Comprehensive National Mercury Monitoring Act. 2011b. S. 1183, 112th Congress, 1st Session. Available: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-112s1183is/html/BILLS-112s1183is.htm> [accessed 9 May 2012].
- Driscoll CT, Han YJ, Chen CY, Evers DC, Lambert KF, Holsen TM, et al. 2007. Mercury contamination in forest and freshwater ecosystems in the northeastern United States. *Bioscience* 57(1):17–28.
- Fitzgerald WF, Lamborg CH, Hammerschmidt CR. 2007. Marine biogeochemical cycling of mercury. *Chem Rev* 107:641–662.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2010. The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2010. Rome:Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Available: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/1820e/i1820e.pdf> [accessed 2 May 2012].
- Grandjean P, Cordier S, Kjellström T, Weihe P, Budtz-Jørgensen E. 2005. Health effects and risk assessments. In: *Dynamics of Mercury Pollution on Regional and Global Scales: Atmospheric Processes and Human Exposures around the World* (Pirrone N, Mahaffey KR, eds). Norwell, MA:Springer, 499–523.
- Karagas MR, Choi AL, Oken E, Horvat M, Schoeny R, Kamai E, et al. 2012. Evidence on the human health effects of low-level methylmercury exposure. *Environ Health Perspect* 120:799–806.
- Lynch ML, Huang LS, Cox C, Strain JJ, Myers GJ, Bonham MP, et al. 2010. Varying coefficient function models to explore interactions between maternal nutritional status and prenatal methylmercury toxicity in the Seychelles Child Development Nutrition Study. *Environ Res* 111:75–80.
- Mahaffey KR, Clickner RP, Jeffries RA. 2009. Adult women's blood mercury concentrations vary regionally in the United States: association with patterns of fish consumption (NHANES 1999–2004). *Environ Health Perspect* 117:47–53.
- Mergler D, Anderson HA, Chan LH, Mahaffey KR, Murray M, Sakamoto M, et al. 2007. Methylmercury exposure and health effects in humans: a worldwide concern. *Ambio* 36(1):3–11.
- Oken E, Choi AL, Karagas MR, Mariën K, Rheinberger CM, Schoeny R, et al. 2012. Which fish should I eat? Perspectives influencing fish consumption choices. *Environ Health Perspect* 120:790–798.
- Oken E, Radesky JS, Wright RO, Bellinger DC, Amarasiwardena CJ, Kleinman KP, et al. 2008. Maternal fish intake during pregnancy, blood mercury levels, and child cognition at age 3 years in a US cohort. *Am J Epidemiol* 167:1171–1181.
- Oken E, Wright RO, Kleinman KP, Bellinger DC, Amarasiwardena CJ, Hu H, et al. 2005. Maternal fish consumption, hair mercury, and infant cognition in a U.S. cohort. *Environ Health Perspect* 113:1376–1380.
- Rice DC. 2004. The US EPA reference dose for methylmercury: sources of uncertainty. *Environ Res* 95(3):406–413.
- Sunderland EM. 2007. Mercury exposure from domestic and imported estuarine and marine fish in the U.S. seafood market. *Environ Health Perspect* 115:235–242.
- UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2009. Overarching Framework: UNEP Global Mercury Partnership. Available: <http://www.chem.unep.ch/mercury/Sector-Specific-Information/Docs/Overarching%20Framework.pdf> [accessed 3 May 2012].
- United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Environment Programme, World Bank, and World Resources Institute. 2003. *World Resources 2002–2004: Decision for the Earth: Balance, Voice and Power*. Washington, DC:World Resources Institute. Available: [http://pdf.wri.org/wr2002\\_fullreport.pdf](http://pdf.wri.org/wr2002_fullreport.pdf) [accessed 8 May 2012].
- U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2010. National Listing of Fish Consumption Advisories: Technical Fact Sheet 2010. Available: [http://water.epa.gov/scitech/swguidance/fishshellfish/fishadvisories/technical\\_factsheet\\_2010.cfm](http://water.epa.gov/scitech/swguidance/fishshellfish/fishadvisories/technical_factsheet_2010.cfm) [accessed 10 May 2012].
- U.S. EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2011. Final Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) for Power Plants. Available: <http://www.epa.gov/airquality/powerplanttoxics/actions.html> [accessed 9 May 2012].

**ehp** 6.09  
IMPACT  
FACTOR


Published monthly by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS)

## EHP Bisphenol A Collection

A lot can happen in five years, especially in the field of environmental health science. Bisphenol A (BPA) research is a prime example of how quickly a body of knowledge can grow and evolve. *EHP* is pleased to present its Bisphenol A Collection, a comprehensive collection of peer-reviewed research on BPA published in *EHP* over the past five years.\*

**What's inside?** The EHP Bisphenol A Collection is offered as a fully searchable pdf file. You'll find brief summaries of dozens of BPA-related commentaries, reviews, and research articles across a breadth of fields:

- Toxicology
- Human Exposure
- Epidemiology
- Regulatory Science



Download your free  
EHP Bisphenol A Collection at  
[www.ehponline.org/collections](http://www.ehponline.org/collections)



\* Articles were published in the print edition of *EHP* between January 2007 and December 2011.